Standard V Program Re-approval Template

Submit completed form to your liaison by June 1, 2009.

Institution: Gonzaga University – Teacher Certification Unit

Date

Dean/Director Signature _____

Elementary Program (Undergraduate/MIT)

Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals (Elementary Program)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	• WIP that includes technology • Literacy unit plan incorporating language arts and communication strategies • WIP including activities to help students understand math processes.	*Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines * Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving *Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning
B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes. All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them.	• Objective assignment • Literacy unit plan • Lesson plans showing alignment between learning targets and standards • Positive Impact Project (PIP) • MIT Research Project	* Students explain the learning target, how it relates to the student, and how she/he is progressing toward it, including next steps and available resources. * Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined
C. Integrated across content areas. All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	• Literacy unit plan • Unit and lesson plans show alignment between learning targets and standards and include integration of content	* Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines * Student products show evidence of integrated content and their capacity to show understanding of critical thinking and reasoning

Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching (Elementary Program)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies.	• WIP/reflection • Miscue analysis project (Reading Diagnosis) • Assessment project • PIP • Collection-Analysis of Student Evidence • MIT Research Project	*Student completed assessments show both formative and summative evaluation aligned with learning targets and reflective of student differences. * Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined
B. Intentionally planned. All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized.	• Differentiated learner case study • 6+1 traits of writing project • Assessment project • MIT Research Project •	* Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels * Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn
C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies. All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	• WIP • Miscue analysis project (Reading Diagnosis) • MIT Research Project	* Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels *Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences * Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used.
D. Informed by technology. All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	• WIP and Unit Plan that include technology	* Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning

Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts (Elementary Program)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment**	**Student-Based Evidence**. *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies.	• WIP • Unit Plan • PIP • Primary readiness assessment.	* Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels * Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn * Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences
B. Classroom/school centered. Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others.	• Differentiated case study • Unit plan	* Students can explain in terms of behavior and procedures what contributes to a productive classroom as a learning community, including: Transition times, use of materials, Student behavior, response to teacher suggestions, homework, respect for others * Collaborative student products and student reflections on the process show the contributions of each participant and the thinking and problem solving that was part of the process
C. Family/Neighborhood centered. Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods.	• Parent communication plan	* Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used.
D. Contextual community centered. All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environ- mentally sustainable globally interconnected, and diverse society.	• Classroom management plan	* Students explain their relationship to the natural environment and the global implications of that relationship for other people.

Standard 5.4: Understanding Teaching as a Profession (Elementary Program)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment**
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting.	• Differentiated case study • WIP/reflection
B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice. All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers.	• Research project with teachers • Reflection paper
C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities. All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	• Classroom management plan • WIP/reflection

Secondary Program (Undergraduate/MIT)

Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals (Secondary)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching* *Number Corresponds to Target Number On Evidence Target and Rubric Document*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	• Written Instructional Plans (WIP) and Unit Plans include reading, written and oral communication, and technology in the specific content areas. • Written Instructional Plan and Unit Plans, show how thinking skills will be taught and used. • Micro teaching, Unit plan, Seminar.	• Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines. • Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving • Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning.
B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes. All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them.	• Written Instructional Plan. • Positive Impact Plan (PIP) • Micro teaching, seminar. • Lessons are planned, taught and assessed to align with curriculum standards and outcomes. • MIT Research Project	• Students explain the learning target, how it relates to the student, and how she/he is progressing toward it, including next steps and available resources. • Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined.
C. Integrated across content areas. All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	• Micro teaching • Written Instructional Plan. • Written Instructional Plan and Unit Plan integrate content across disciplines.	• Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines. • Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving

Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching (Secondary)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching* *Number Corresponds to Target Number On Evidence Target and Rubric Document*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies.	• Written Instructional Plan • PIP • Collection-Analysis of Student Evidence • Personalized Assessment Project. • Written Instructional Plan and Unit Plan. • Assessment Observation Log. • MIT Research Project	• Student completed assessments show both formative and summative evaluation aligned with learning targets and reflective of student differences. • Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined.
B. Intentionally planned. All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized.	• Student Artifact Analysis • Written Instructional Plan and Unit Plan. • PIP • MIT Research Project	• Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels. • Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn.
C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies. All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	• Written Instructional Plan • Unit includes multiple instructional strategies. • MIT Research Project • **Interdisciplinary Unit plan including a variety of strategies from Gardner to Mossten**	• Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels. • Student products show naturally occurring, multicultural influences. • Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used.
D. Informed by technology. All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	• PowerPoint presentation, internet research, etc. • Written Instructional Plan and unit plans. • **Peer Teaching using a variety of technologies to include standard classroom technologies heart rate monitors, pedometers, Wii, etc.**	• Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning

Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts (Secondary)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching* *Number Corresponds to Target Number On Evidence Target and Rubric Document*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies.	• Written Instructional Plan and Unit Plan include a variety of resources that are culturally inclusive. • **Video recordings demonstrating stated competencies**	• Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels. • Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn. • Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences.
B. Classroom/school centered. Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others.	• Classroom Management project. • Cooperative Learning Lesson Plan.	• Students can explain in terms of behavior and procedures what contributes to a productive classroom as a learning community, including: Transition times, use of materials, student behavior, response to teacher suggestions, homework, and respect for others. • Collaborative student products and reflections on the process show the contributions of each participant and the thinking and problem solving that was part of the process.
C. Family/Neighborhood centered. Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods.	• Family Interaction Plan.	• Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used.
D. Contextual community centered. All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable globally interconnected, and diverse society.	• Debates, oral presentations, and respect for others' opinions. • Issues of sustainability and diversity in Unit Plans.	• Students explain their relationship to the natural environment and the global implications of that relationship for other people.

Standard 5.4: Understanding of Teaching as a Profession

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment**
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting.	• Differentiated case study • Reflection Assignment on professionalism • WIP/reflection
B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice. All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers.	• Research project with teachers • Attendance at professional conferences or reading of professional literature/reflection of reading attendance • Reflection paper
C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities. All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	• Classroom management plan • WIP/reflection

Special Education – Undergraduate

Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals (Special Education – Undergraduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in some field experiences and student teaching*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	Written Instructional. Plan that includes technology Child behavior change project write-up Applied content exams, application practice, and teaching practice Written Instructional. Plan including activities to help students understand math processes. Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines (related to age and functional level) Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving (related to age and functional level) Students use technology (when appropriate based on age and functional level) when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning Results of data/graphs on child response Pedagogy assessment outcomes
B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes. All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them.	Objective assignment IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Curriculum-based assessment (CBA) plan Lesson plans showing alignment between learning targets and standards	Students explain or demonstrates the learning target, how it relates to the student, and how she/he is progressing toward it, including next steps and available resources (related to age and functional level). Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined Results from completing the CBA
C. Integrated across content areas. All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	Applied content exams, teaching practice Child behavior change project write-up Child behavior change project write-up	Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving Child pre/post test results Results of data/graphs on child responses Results of data/graphs on child responses

Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching (Special Education – Undergraduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies.	Written Instructional. Plan /reflection Curriculum-based assessment (CBA) plan Child behavior change project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO)	Student completed assessments show both formative and summative evaluation aligned with learning targets and reflective of student differences. Students explain the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined Results from completing the CBA Results of data/graphs on child response Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and child behaviors using the ITCO form
B. Intentionally planned. All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized.	Differentiated learner case study Child behavior change project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn Results of data/graphs on child response Pedagogy assessment outcomes
C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies. All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Written Instructional. Plan Child behavior change project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO)	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used. Results of data/graphs on child response

		Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and child behaviors using the ITCO form
D. Informed by technology. All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO) Written Instructional. Plan that includes technology	Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and child behaviors using the ITCO form

Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts (Special Education – Undergraduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence**. *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies.	Child behavior change project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels Students communicate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences Results of data/graphs on child responses Pedagogy assessment outcomes
B. Classroom/school centered. Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others.	Differentiated case study Final evaluation Final evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Students can explain in terms of behavior and procedures what contributes to a productive classroom as a learning community, including: Transition times, use of materials, Student behavior, response to teacher suggestions, homework, respect for others Collaborative student products and student reflections on the process show the contributions of each participant and the thinking and problem solving that was part of the process Pedagogy assessment outcomes
C. Family/Neighborhood centered. Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods.	Parent communication plan IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used. Pedagogy assessment outcomes

D. Contextual community centered. All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environ- mentally sustainable globally interconnected, and diverse society.	Classroom management plan Content exams Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Students explain their relationship to the natural environment and the global implications of that relationship for other people. Pedagogy assessment

Standard 5.4: Understanding Teaching as a Profession (Special Education – Undergraduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting.	Differentiated case study IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Final evaluation Final evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan
B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice. All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers.	Research project with teachers Reflection paper Final evaluation Final evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan
C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities. All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	Classroom management plan Content exams Final evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan/reflection

Special Education (Graduate)

Standard 5.1: Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals (Special Education – Graduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in some field experiences and student teaching*
A. Content driven. All students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up Applied content exams, application practice, and teaching practice Written Instructional Plan including activities that address content understanding. Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show accurate content knowledge of key skills and concepts reflecting state, district, and school goals and connections among disciplines (related to age and functional level) Students use technology (when appropriate based on age and functional level) when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses Pedagogy assessment outcomes
B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes. All students know the learning targets and their progress towards meeting them.	Objective assignment IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Curriculum-based assessment (CBA) plan Lesson plans showing alignment between learning targets and standards	Students explain or demonstrate the learning target, how it relates to the student, and how she/he is progressing toward it, including next steps and available resources (related to age and functional level). Results from completing the CBA
C. Integrated across content areas. All students learn subject matter content that integrates mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	Applied content exams, teaching practice Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up	Student products show evidence of critical thinking and problem solving (related to age and functional level) Student scores on tests including pre/post test. Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses

Standard 5.2: Knowledge of Teaching (Special Education – Graduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence** *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Informed by standards-based assessment. All students benefit from learning that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies.	Curriculum-based assessment (CBA) plan Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO)	Student completed assessments show both formative and summative evaluation aligned with learning targets and reflective of student differences based on age and functional level. Students explain or demonstrate the relationship between assessment and learning targets, including ways in which individual progress is determined based on age and functional level. Student responses after completing the CBA Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and child behaviors using the ITCO form
B. Intentionally planned. All students benefit from standards-based planning that is personalized.	Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels based on age and functional level. Students communicate or demonstrate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn based on age and functional level. Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses
C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies. All students benefit from personalized instruction that addresses their ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO)	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels based on age and functional level. Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences

		based on age and functional level. Students explain or demonstrate how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used based on age and functional level. Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and student behaviors using the ITCO form
D. Informed by technology. All students benefit from instruction that utilizes effective technologies and is designed to create technologically proficient learners.	Pedagogy assessment lesson plan and instructional teaching criteria observation (ITCO)	Students use technology when engaging in learning and in the demonstration of learning based on age and functional level. Pedagogy assessment outcomes and observation of teacher and student behaviors using the ITCO form

Standard 5.3: Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts (Special Education – Graduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**	**Student-Based Evidence**. *Collected in all field experiences and student teaching*
A. Learner centered. All students engage in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age appropriate strategies.	Evidence-based student outcomes project write-up Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Student products show varied paths to a learning target, reflecting differences in ability, learning styles, or developmental levels based on age and functional level. Students communicate or demonstrate how and why they are participating in learning activities and what their uniqueness brings to the learning community both in experience, and how they learn based on age and functional level. Student products show naturally occurring multicultural influences based on age and functional level. Results of data/graphs on student(s) responses
B. Classroom/school centered. Student learning is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, including knowledge and skills for working with others.	Field experience evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Students can explain or demonstrate in terms of behavior and procedures what contributes to a productive classroom as a learning community, including: Transition times, use of materials, Student behavior, response to teacher suggestions, homework, respect for others based on age and functional level. Collaborative student products and student reflections on the process show the contributions of each participant and the thinking and problem solving that was part of the process based on age and functional level.
C. Family/Neighborhood centered. Student learning is informed by collaboration with families and neighborhoods.	IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Pedagogy assessment lesson plan - including a communication plan re: parent	Students explain how learning relates to self and family, how family is involved in the learning and how community resources are used based on age and functional level
D. Contextual community centered. All students are prepared to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable globally interconnected, and diverse society.	Content exams Pedagogy assessment lesson plan	Students explain their relationship to the natural environment and the global implications of that relationship for other people based on age and functional level. Pedagogy assessment outcomes

Standard 5.4: Understanding Teaching as a Profession (Special Education – Graduate)

Criteria - *Teacher candidates positively impact student learning that is:*	**Candidate Evidence/ Assessment (for sample outcomes)**
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies. All students benefit from a collegial and professional school setting.	IEP project (development of Mock IEP) Field experience evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan
B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice. All students benefit from the professional growth of their teachers.	Field experience evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan
C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities. All students benefit from a safe and respectful learning environment.	Content exams Field experience evaluation Pedagogy assessment lesson plan/reflection

1. In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:

- **Course content**
- **Field experiences**
- **P-12 district/school partnerships**
- **Faculty development**

In areas where no changes were necessary, briefly indicate why.

Changes to Program

The Gonzaga University Teacher Certification Unit consists of three departments: Sport and Physical Education (PE), Special Education (SPED) and Teacher Education (TE). We have broken our proposal into 6 programs, as outlined in the above templates: Undergraduate Elementary Education, MIT Elementary Education, Undergraduate Secondary, MIT Secondary, Undergraduate Special Education, and MIT Special Education. Our programs have gone through, and will continue to go through, significant program changes as a result of the shifting paradigm brought about by the new Standard V requirements. The changes are reflected at the course level through changes to course offerings, course content, and course assessments. Additionally, changes are reflected through the construction and coordination of field experiences, particularly through the assessments that will be used to engage candidates in analysis of an impact on student learning through the use of student evidence as well as the alignment between field expectations and linked field experience courses. Throughout the report, the narrative will represent the entirety of the Gonzaga Certification Program, but will include sub-headings where programs and departments differentiate the delivery of experiences to candidates. Below are the four categories that outline our response to question #1.

Course Content:

The changes related to course content can be broken down into two categories: content integration and new courses.

Course Integration:

Throughout the fall, the Department of Teacher Education reviewed the programs' (elementary and secondary) scope and sequence with particular attention to key content areas: literary, cultural

competency, assessment, and sustainability. We engaged in a comprehensive review and redesign such that the above content areas were delineated as "introduced, reinforced, and further developed" as each delivery point in the program throughout the scope and sequence. One of the most significant changes is the increasing attention being paid to assessment practices in the strategies and methods of coursework.

The Sport & Physical Education Department (PE) is also examining avenues to incorporate literacy, cultural competency and sustainability within current courses required for the Health & Fitness endorsement. PE is considering incorporating two of the three new courses delineated below (Special Education Student Teaching Seminar and Student Teaching Seminar) into their endorsement. They currently have an assessment course which meets the current standard guidelines. At the present time, they are looking at the impact of credits these changes will have on students completing the health and fitness endorsement.

The Special Education Department (SPED) has examined the need for teacher candidates to demonstrate evidence-based instructional strategies, assessment of student skills, and the program's ability to meet the integration of content related areas determined by standard V in relationship to the complex nature of our student population. This review led us to a revision of content within existing courses. The content revisions addressed response to intervention (RTI) and the relationship that differing disabilities have on the ability to gain, retain, and integrate content knowledge such as reading, writing, mathematics, sustainability, technology, etc. Additional courses continue be under review to address integration of content regarding ethical, behavioral, and social standards necessary to create safe teaching environments. SPED currently has an assessment course that meets the standard guidelines and has several courses that meet the Special Education Student Teaching Seminar content. Consideration is being made on the integration of certain student teaching seminar meetings within the certification unit.

<u>New Courses:</u>

One result of the new paradigm was the proposal of new courses for our programs. In each case, the courses under development are seen as being particularly important for increasing attention to the gathering and analyzing evidence of an impact on student learning.

Undergraduate Program:

These new courses were developed as a result of the program review/redesign process at the undergraduate level: Classroom-Based assessment, Special Education Student Teaching Seminar, Student Teaching Seminar. Included below are the course descriptions for each of these new courses:

Classroom Based Assessment:

This course will introduce and practice the processes of assessing whether students are meeting articulated outcomes, addressing the question, "How do we know our students learned the material?" Multiple methods and types of classroom assessments will be analyzed and evaluated for the purposes of creating a systematic framework that implements, collects, and reviews assessment data. The following assessment components will be discussed, applied and evaluated: timely and appropriate feedback; formative, summative and diagnostic methodologies; classroom assessment instruments; self-assessment applications; clear criteria; scoring guides and rubrics; and, content-specific assessment practices. Content will be organized to support the creation of a personalized assessment philosophy.

Special Education Student Teaching Seminar:

The purpose of this course is to review and reinforce information regarding students with disabilities and the laws and procedures that govern their education. Candidates will enhance skills through a seminar format in accordance to the mandates of the 2004 IDEiA and its linkages to regular education teachers. Emphasis will be given to the mandate of pre referral interventions, 504 plans, and base qualifications for special education services for students as based on student performance in the regular classroom.

Student Teaching Seminar:

This course meets during the student teaching semester. Candidates will be placed in their respective student teaching sites at the beginning of the semester and will be provided with periodic returns in a seminar format that extends understanding of formative, summative and diagnostic assessment, and attends to important issues related to student teaching. A primary focus of this course will be to facilitate and provide guided practice in the development of assessment and instructional practices, including candidates' practice at analyzing assessment data to evaluate the evidence of an impact on student learning and adjusting instruction accordingly. Additionally, this course is designed to facilitate and support candidates in their respective student teaching placements and provide an opportunity for candidates to have faculty/staff support as well as time to dialogue with peers.

Graduate Program:

The graduate program (MIT) changes to courses were focused on the research class. This course is designed to facilitate candidate's completion of a classroom-based research project. This will be done through the delivery of the following sequence of courses: EDTE 631 – Introduction to Education Research, EDTE 632 – Research and Assessment, EDTE 633 – Research and Evaluation, EDTE 689 – Professional Seminar. Below is a summary description of this course sequence:

MIT Research (EDTE 631-633) Course Description:

This introduction to practitioner-based research will lay the groundwork and expectation for a Master's level publication to be completed by the end of the MIT program. Content to be introduced include: characteristics of practitioner research, applicable research terminology, qualitative and quantitative methodologies, topic selection, teacher-as-researcher skills, and the literature review structure.

Overview of Course:

This course is the first in a series of courses designed to support Master's level candidates in the use of practitioner research. The research component to Gonzaga's MIT program is guided by the belief that pre-service Master's level candidates will be served best by developing research skills that inform practice. This teacher-as-researcher approach will place more emphasis on developing candidate

knowledge and skills that apply to the candidate's own classroom and the students s/he faces during the course of a school day. Often called practitioner-based research, this approach is designed to ask and answer real problems with real students in real schools with the overall hope of improving practice through research-based observation.

MIT candidates will produce a Practitioner Research Project (PRP). This project will consist of completing the following four components:

(1) Instructional Strategy Literature Review

(2) Instructional Context/Knowledge of Students' Analysis

(3) Research Proposal:
- Literature Review Summary
- Research Topic
- Research Timeline
- Data Collection Techniques
- Data Analysis Methodology
- Data Interpretations/Conclusions

(4) Research Submission for Publication.

The Practitioner Research Project is designed to be a collaborative effort of two MIT candidates. This collaboration will focus on the efficacy of a specific instructional strategy with the outcome of producing a submission for publication. Practitioner-based methodologies and collaborative project plans will be introduced, practiced, analyzed and evaluated during Summer I and Fall I semesters. Student data will be collected, analyzed and interpreted during Spring I and Summer II semesters. Completed project and publishable submission will be completed during Summer II semester.

Field Experience:

Similar to the course content changes, field experience expectations were reviewed, through the lens of a program scope-and-sequence, so as to more tightly align them with the respective linked content courses. A couple of themes have emerged regarding our redesigned field experience: more intentional collaboration/coordination between field placement and linked course; connect faculty better to P-12 sites; engage candidates in gathering and analysis of student evidence in field experiences.

Collaboration/Coordination:

We have spent a good deal of time over the course of the year obtaining and reflecting on the evidence - based paradigm precipitated by the new Standard V precipitates. A couple fundamental outcomes resulted from this process:

1). Courses linked to field experiences will engage candidates in assignments/assessments that will draw upon their respective experiences in field placements.

2). There will be a growing level of collaboration between the field office, GU faculty and cooperating teachers to ensure that the activities/assessments candidates are engaged in are aligned with the needs of the cooperating teachers and the P-12 students with whom our candidates are engaged.

This past semester, the department of teacher education has hosted two working meetings with local P-12 teachers and administrators to redesign our initial field placement experience. We expect to continue these conversations as part of an on-going effort to develop university/P-12 partnerships. These meetings have resulted in adding a model with the following characteristics: saturation placements; front-loading coursework and back-loading fieldwork.

- Saturation: The goal of our new field experience paradigm, initially at the 221 level, but eventually across the field experience continuum, is to ensure the placement of multiple candidates at single sites. This approach will help in the following ways:
    - Cohort model would allow for the placement of multiple candidates in one site and would facilitate the group operating as a professional learning team made up of pre-

service candidates, cooperating teachers, University Supervisors, and University faculty. This would allow for peer-observation and dialogue, would allow University Supervisors and faculty to visit multiple candidates at single sites, and would tighten the communication structure as a result.

- Front-Loaded Coursework/ Back-Loaded Fieldwork: Candidates' content course (i.e. 221-Diff. Instruction and Assessment) and field experience (221L- Lab) are being scheduled as a block, i.e. 9-11 M/W/F. During the first part, Candidates will spend the majority of the time at the University engaging in coursework designed to introduce them to Differentiated instructional and Assessment practices that they will begin to employ in their respective placements in the later part of the semester. This will allow, in particular, for the University Supervisors to know well the content that is designed and the subsequent aligned expectations the candidates will be faced within the field. Following the completion of much of the contact time for the course, candidates will dedicate much of their time in the field placement, since much of the coursework will be complete. This will free-up the faulty to visit the placement sites and meet up with cohort groups and cooperating teachers at the site.

The PE Department currently offers three distinctly different field experiences in addition to the student teaching experience since they are a K-12 endorsement in two different content areas (as taught in the school districts) – health education and physical education. One field experience is at the elementary level, in physical education, one field experience is either at the middle school or high school level in physical education and the third field experience is at the high school level in health education (rationale for only one health experience is that it is not taught by a specialist at the elementary or middle school level). The "saturation" model is being explored for the elementary experience and the secondary/middle school physical education experience. For the health education experience this is proving to be more difficult, due to the limited number of offerings at the high school and times of the offerings conflicting with other required SPE courses. The Department has limited course offerings and

student schedule is quite tight, so flexibility is not always an option. They are looking at avenues to modify course offerings that will help alleviate the time crunch for the students.

On the positive side, for the past two years the PE Department has linked specific courses to field experiences and engaged candidates in assignments/assessments that draw upon their respective experiences in field placements. They currently "debrief" via seminars conducted within the linked course approximately four times a semester. Assignments required are directly related to the particular field experience the student is engaged in at that particular time. Since "faculty" from the Department currently supervise the field experience student, there is already a strong linkage from field to class, and they plan to continue the model.

SPED candidates complete fieldwork with specific courses to ensure application of skill development. Currently candidates take 2 SPED field experience classes (1 elementary level & 1 secondary level), a minimum of 1 regular education field experience course, an integrated preschool experience in a lab school setting, as well as applied work linked to courses prior to completing student teaching. This allows for course content to correspond with the experiences that the candidates experience while in the school/applied setting. If candidates are unable to match filed experiences specified course the faculty member assists the candidate in finding school aged children to complete evidence-based change projects since they are required as part of the course requirements. Fieldwork is aligned to course requirements, development of state competencies and expectations of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). Field experiences are designed to provide candidates opportunities for growth and development with the expectation for reflection as part of their growth process.

Student Teaching Professional-Seminar

We have also proposed two new professional seminar courses to our program – EDTE 495 & EDSE 450– which will be taught during the student teaching semester. These courses are designed in a seminar format and are meant to provide candidates with the opportunity, during their student teaching placement, to return to campus, under the guidance of the faculty and the field experience staff, to discuss student teaching issues in general. The proposed EDSE 450 course is designed to reinforce

information regarding students with disabilities and the laws and procedures that govern their education. The proposed EDTE 495 is a seminar designed to support all areas of a successful student teaching, but assessment and evidence issues are attended to more specifically. One of the major projects for candidates during student teaching is the completion of the "Positive Impact Project" which is an assessment designed to engage our students in the gathering and evaluation of student-based evidence that has been gathered as a result of assessments administered during student teaching.

P-12 District Partnerships:

This past May, Dean Jon Sunderland convened a steering committee for our Standard V work on program review/redesign. Through dialogue and collaboration with the Superintendent of Spokane Public Schools, we gained the participation of the district in our work through the appointment of the Director of Certificated Staff Support Services. Additionally, a former high school principal, who is currently a University Supervisor, was invited to sit on this steering committee. In addition to providing valuable insight as to the P-12 landscape in which our candidates are placed, district protocols, an emerging partnership discussion resulted. One notable element that resulted was an invitation, on the part of the district, for faculty and program personnel to participate in the professional development, induction workshops, etc. that the district engages P-12 teachers and administrators in through on-going professional development.

An example of this is the efforts, over the course of the past semester, of the Teacher Education department to engage in conversations with two local high schools and one local elementary school to begin to outline a framework for working in partnership. These schools have expressed a willingness to explore the development of partnerships that will allow for one-year field placements, saturation placements (multiple candidates in one site) along with a co-teaching model of student teaching. We believe that these partnerships represent an important opportunity to work collaboratively with P-12 partners to navigate the shifting landscape.

The PEAB has spent considerable time, and will continue to do so throughout the year, providing advisement regarding the gathering of student evidence and the design of partnerships. More

specifically, the PEAB was asked for input regarding student evidence. This input focused on the sub-categories (5.1.a, 5.1.b, etc) and examples of student evidences that they suggested our candidates could reasonably be expected to gather in the school setting. Additionally, the PEAB spent considerable time providing recommendations as to the development of partnerships with local K-12 schools. The PEAB members were asked for responses to the following questions:

a. What would it take for schools/districts to see partnerships with Gonzaga's teacher preparation (particularly as related to field and student teaching placement) as value-added for K-12 students and teachers?
b. In what ways could Gonzaga Candidates be helpful to K-12 schools?
c. In what ways could the Gonzaga Faculty be helpful to K-12 schools?
d. In what ways could K-12 schools be helpful to Gonzaga students?
e. In what ways could K-12 schools be helpful to Gonzaga Faculty?
f. What are some institutional characteristics, in both K-12 schools and Gonzaga, which would need to be in place for the ideas above to be implemented?

The results of the input on both examples of student evidence and partnership components is currently being collated and will be reviewed at the next PEAB meeting with the goal of generating some specific recommendations aligned to the results of these discussions. Additionally, the PEAB input will be shared with the relevant departments so that they are able to include this in their discussion about and delivery of relevant coursework.

Gonzaga is also involved with Whitworth University, WSU, and Eastern Washington University in an OSPI grant to collaboratively inform Eastern Washington School Districts about the impending changes that Standard V may bring to candidate field placement schemes and partnership arrangements between teacher education programs and K-12 schools. Representatives of each collaborative higher education institution made presentations at an ESD 101 superintendents meeting to help prepare school administrators for these coming changes.

Faculty Development:

At the outset of the new Standard V, faculty spent considerable time dialoguing such that we were working from a similar framework as it relates to the new paradigm. Many of the faculty spent time reading and familiarizing themselves with the excellent work of Linda Darling-Hammond, particularly

the text: *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do* (Editor, with John Bransford, Jossey-Bass, 2005). Faculty members and program personnel have been involved in a number of meetings, workshops, and presentations related to the new Standard V paradigm:

- OSPI PEAB conference – Fall, 2008 – Faculty and program personnel were present at the presentation by the Pilot Grant recipients who were working with Western Washington University as part of their Standard V partnership implementation grant.
- ESD 101 Conference, Dr. Robert Marzano, *Getting Serious About School reform: An Overview of the Three Critical Commitments*. February 12, 8:30-4
- OSPI/Higher Education Assessment Conference, April 16-17, Sea-Tac Marriott
- Higher Education/P-12 workshop: *The Evidence Based Paradigm: A Discussion About New Directions for Teacher Preparation*, Red Lion Hotel (April 20, 8-12).
- Mentoring Teacher Candidates Through Co-Teaching, Presentation for Washington State University by St. Cloud University – College of Education, April 28, 2009.
- OSPI Representatives Lois Davies and Marilyn Simpson provided three consecutive presentations on Gonzaga University campus to teacher candidates, field supervisors, faculty and staff (Fall 07, Spring 08, Fall 08).
- OSPI Representatives Lois Davies and Marilyn Simpson provided an interactive training session on Standard V Student Based Evidence to the faculty on Gonzaga University campus Fall 08.

Finally, faculty and program personnel are also engaged in book studies of works by Marzano (*Assessment and Grading that Works; The Art and Science of Teaching*) and Stiggins (*Classroom Assessment for Student Learning: Doing it Right Using it Well*) that are aligned with the paradigm shift that Standard V represents. In addition, faculty are sharing information on assessment, particularly as it relates to student evidence and student voice, that have been gathered at various conferences. These efforts to remain engaged in the current research, as well as the current realities as articulated by P-12 partners, represent an important focus of the ongoing program revision work. Additionally, the faculty have formed various sub-committees which include the field director, supervisors, teachers and administrators from the surrounding school districts. The purpose of these sub-committees is to share

knowledge and create working relationships that enhance the learning experiences for the teacher candidates, provide support to the classroom teacher, and increased successes for the P-12 students.

2. **In no more than three pages, describe the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.**

The process of reviewing, rethinking and revising the program is on-going for the departments. Each department is constantly engaged in a reflective process to ensure that our program meets the state and national standards, as well as the needs of our candidates, the P-12 institutions, cooperating teachers and students with whom we work.

Beginning with the 07-08 school year, departments began the process with extensive conversation about moving to an evidence-based system such as one being precipitated by the new Standard V paradigm. Initially, our work focused on developing a common language/discourse around this new paradigm. We spent some time looking at the alignment between the new Standard V protocol with the existing Performance-Based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA now referred to as the EBPA) instrument that is used to assess candidates during their respective student teaching. We determined that due to the pending revisions of the PPA instrument, that this would not be an effective use of our time. Additionally, the department worked with Lois Davies and Marilyn Simpson over the course of two different meetings. During these meetings, we had the opportunity to navigate through the IN ACTION program. This model enriched our understanding of elements of positive impact on student learning with particular attention to personalized instruction and the importance of student voice as an indicator of evidence of an impact on student learning.

Last May, the Dean of the School of Education (Dr. Jon Sunderland) convened a steering committee to focus on the revised state Standard V. This committee was comprised of the three certification departments (teacher education, special education, and physical education), the field experience office, the Director of Certification, a university supervisor and local district personnel. The work continued throughout the summer focusing on the scope and sequence of our teacher certification programs,

candidate and student evidence, alignment of NCATE requirements, key assessments, field experiences/practicum and partnerships. Additionally, the PEAB has been a vital source of information and collaboration and has been instrumental in helping to develop partnerships.

In the Fall of 2008, the departments took the recommendations of the steering committee and worked on implementing them. The departments engaged in a comprehensive review and redesign of our programs' scope and sequence to facilitate the implementation of the new Standard V. The process included the development of new program and course outcomes, key assessments, and field experience expectations that would facilitate collection of candidate and student evidence.

In addition to the above process, faculty members and program personnel have been involved in a number of meetings/workshops/presentations related to the new Standard V:

- OSPI PEAB conference – Fall, 2008 – Faculty and program personnel were present at the presentation by the Pilot Grant recipients who were working with Western Washington University as part of their Standard V partnership implementation grant.
- ESD 101 Conference, Dr. Robert Marzano, *Getting Serious About School reform: An Overview of the Three Critical Commitments*. February 12, 8:30-4
- OSPI/Higher Education Assessment Conference, April 16-17, Sea-Tac Marriott
- Higher Education/P-12 workshop: *The Evidence Based Paradigm: A Discussion About New Directions for Teacher Preparation*, Red Lion Hotel (April 20, 8-12).
- Mentoring Teacher Candidates Through Co-Teaching, Presentation for Washington State University by St. Cloud University – College of Education, April 28, 2009.

The departments have also convened two working groups that include department members, program personnel and community P-12 educators. One group is collaborating with us on the development of a new Elementary Education Major, while the other group is advising us on a redesigned field experience paradigm. In both cases, the input from the field-based partners, in conjunction with on-going faculty and program personnel, is informing our work and the process by which we review and revise our program. Finally, faculty and program personnel are also engaged in

book studies of works of best practices that are aligned with the paradigm shift that Standard V represents. All of these efforts represent an important focus of the ongoing program revision work.

3. **In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies**.

As described in the overview of our programs, our candidates will experience an added emphasis in the area of assessment. This emphasis will focus on gathering, analyzing, and responding to evidence of an impact on student learning. Assessment will be a key concept and skill that will be scaffolded and spiraled throughout our program. In addition to the major assessments described below, assessment practices will be taught and modeled throughout the program.

In the new Classroom-Based Assessment course (EDTE 315), a key objective is that "Students analyze and interpret student work samples to make informed instructional decisions." This will be an early introduction to and opportunity to practice generating, analyzing and responding to student-based evidence. Candidates will engage in a case study where they will look at lesson objectives, lesson delivery, and resulting assessment results as evidence. The objective is for students to demonstrate their understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of various forms of assessment data in search of the evidence required to suggest that instruction has been effective.

In subsequent methods courses, all candidates will engage in an assessment titled: *Collection and Analysis of Student Evidence* (*See appendix #1*). This assessment will be delivered in the secondary and elementary discipline specific methods which are linked to field placements. The teacher candidate will engage, in partnership with the cooperating teacher, in the development of a teaching experience that focuses on the teaching and assessment of a particular skill. Teacher candidates will align the assessment to the objective of the learning experience, and will collect student evidence that will be evaluated to determine if the teacher candidate has had an impact on student learning.

In the Reading, Writing and Communication II course (EDTE 331/EDTE 540), one of the assessments for this course serves as a primary strategy to engage elementary teacher candidates in analyzing and responding to student based evidence: *Collection and Analysis of Student Evidence - Reading Diagnosis* (*See appendix #2*). Candidates will be asked to identify a "struggling" reader within

your field experience classroom. This could be a student who struggles with the reading process in some way, i.e. demonstrates an inconsistency in reading ability, reads well but doesn't comprehend, doesn't enjoy reading, etc. Once that student has been identified, the teacher candidate will keep a journal and include the following information:

- observational notes on the student's behaviors in class, both academically and socially
- assumptions on the student's multiple intelligences from least to most dominant
- background information on the student's home life
- information on the student as a person
- miscue analysis
- retro-miscue analysis

Finally, during the proposed student teaching professional seminar (EDTE 495), candidates will engage in a *Positive Impact on Student Learning Project (PIP): Analysis of Student Work* (*See appendix #3*). This project will focus on teacher candidates' ability to observe, gather, assess and interpret student evidence that informs future instructional decisions. These decisions, based on student data, will set into motion a series of data-driven actions that meets the needs of individual students, several students or a whole class in light of the work they produce. Additionally, this assessment will accompany the capstone student teaching experience, and should provide candidates with evidence necessary to support the successful completion of the Performance-Based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA), which we have been led to believe will also require candidates to provide evidence of an impact on student learning.

The PE Department has already begun engaging in the aspect of assessment to guide student learning. A portion of the PPA is designed with this particular outcome in mind and one of the major "assessments" for candidates to use during the student teaching experience. The details of other student assessments that will precede this final assessment discussed above have not been thoroughly developed. It proves to be a bit more difficult in the physical activity environment where there are limited assessment opportunities. One avenue the Department is pursuing is a

video option, where a lesson is taught and candidates review the lesson to determine if the objectives were met and where student learning took place. A third avenue for "*developing the capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence*" will take place in the assessment course. Candidates will be given samples of student work in which they will grade and make recommendation for future learning in that particular area. Since Health and Fitness endorsement candidates will also be participating in the Student Teaching Seminar course, they will be expected to complete that "assessment" as well.

SPED candidates experience a program that continues to emphasize the importance of gaining knowledge to make data-based decisions regarding student outcomes and learning. Starting with a basic content course taken in the first year of the program, candidates are expected to collect data on student performance and use it to make decisions about what strategies should be considered to improve student learning. As they progress in the program additional experiences working with students in the field supplemented by the required coursework enhances candidates ability to make decisions based on student products that improve student outcomes (*See appendix #4 -Classroom Management Project: Collecting and Evaluating Student-based Evidence*). In addition, a key concept that assists with data-based decision making is addressed through a course on informal and formal assessment, particularly related to the gathering, analyzing and responding to evidence obtained that impacts student learning. In this course candidates assess student performance using several different assessment types and implement a teaching plan based on the results of the assessments (*See appendix #5 – Assessment Project*). The faculty member teaching the assessment course visits each classroom environment at least twice during the semester to assist with candidate questions and to review progress. During the student teaching semester, candidates are observed several times to gain knowledge about their teaching in addition to the completion for the PPA. A key component of some of these observations is to not only observing the candidate but to observe student performance to see if candidates are addressing the needs of the student. In a SPED classroom identifying "student voice" may take on many different forms based on the age and level of the student. To address this difference, the SPED dept has created an

observation form where the supervisor observes and writes specifics about what the student does to show understanding (*See appendix #6 – Observation of candidate and student learning*). In addition to the major/key assessments described above (appendixes 4-6), please note that additional assessment practices will be taught and modeled throughout the program.

4. **In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation**.

The program review process that the new Standard V precipitated has caused the Department of Teacher Education to explore the development of an Elementary Education Major. This new major would allow for an increased coursework in pedagogy for our candidates. As one of the few institutions in the state without an elementary education degree, we believe that time is appropriate for us to pursue this new delivery model. The degree program will take pressure off of our candidates' schedules due to University core and major requirements, and will allow for additional instruction and preparation in teacher preparation.

The PEAB engaged in discussion on the development of the degree program and provided input, in particular, In addition to significant input on this issue from the PEAB, we have convened a working advisory group made up of department and program personnel as well as P-12 partners from the field. This group has met three times over the course of the semester and will continue to do so as the new major is developed and designed. The PEAB and the advisory group have focused their deliberations and recommendations on issues related to: Assessment, Instruction, Planning, Differentiation, and The nature of students.

While still in development, we believe that the creation of a teacher candidate portfolio is a direction that our program will pursue. We believe this type of system will support the collection, analysis and display of student evidence that reflects an impact on student learning. Additionally, we believe that this approach will support a continuum of professional development from initial certification, to professional certification, to National Board certification. In order to do so, we will collaborate with the director of professional certification, and our local faculty National Board trainer to develop a portfolio which is consistent with the procedures which are used by each of these programs. Additionally, this process of developing a portfolio will also facilitate the development of new Key Assessments for our program that will be part of a comprehensive assessment system.

Finally, we will continue to define and develop the *Gonzaga Promise*. The following are recommendations for strengthening the connections between the School of Education and its undergraduates, graduates, and alumni. Many of these cost little except for time and attention to current educational practices and relationships. Others will take monetary and personnel resources to accomplish.

1. All faculty and staff of the School of Education will remain current in pedagogy, technology, and content.
2. The School of Education will work with local school districts to provide appropriate and diverse field placements.
3. The School of Education will work with local districts to maintain partnerships and secure knowledge of current trends and practices within those districts to be imbedded in the courses taught in the programs.
4. The School of Education will provide an environment supportive of collegial work in education.
5. For Gonzaga School of Education graduates, the School will provide a website that will support on-going communication with the School of Education and in addition will provide resources regarding current practice and resources. Additionally, the School of Education will provide a Professional Certification program at a reasonable cost and conducive to the demands of working professionals Finally, the SOE will provide relevant graduate degree programs as a reasonable cost and courses and workshops addressing current practice at a reasonable cost and at times appropriate for practicing teachers, i.e. evenings, Saturdays, summers.
6. For Catholic school teachers, the School of Education will work with diocesan school districts to provide on-going staff development especially appropriate to the demands of an evolving Catholic school experience.

While there remains a great deal of on-going work to be done, the department looks forward to continuing to reviewing and revising our program through decision-making informed by current research-based best practices and through our work with local P-12 partners.

The PE Department will continue to focus on the main aspect of Standard V, especially those of partnerships and collaboration. In addition, the scheduling and course offering must be reviewed in order for the program to move forward and offer the strongest experience possible for candidates.

The SPED department will continue to refine our ability to demonstrate "student voice" since the form in which it may be displayed is likely to vary. We will also continue to develop partnerships and collaboration to benefit the development of our candidates and p-12 partners.

5. Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.

May 26, 2009

To Whom it may concern,

This letter is on behalf of the Professional Educators Advisory Board of Gonzaga University in support of the teacher preparation program revisions brought about by standards from the State (Standard V).

During the 2008-2009 school year, the PEAB was asked to continue to address the WAC 181-78A-261 Approval Standard – Program Design.

This year the PEAB was focused on Standard V's implementation process; with a planned start up in September of 2009. Specifically, were in the planning stages of creating partnerships between individual schools, Gonzaga staff, and teacher candidates. Ideally, we plan to implement a full year classroom experience for each Gonzaga teacher candidate. The first half of the year would count as their 30 hour classroom experience and the second half their student teaching.

The PEAB also provided valuable input with regard to the Master Teacher's role in the student teaching experience, student teacher evaluation, and school partnerships. It was recommended that Master teachers no longer follow a "sink or swim" philosophy, where everything is handed over to the student teacher with little or no feedback. Instead, they would be asked to actively participate as a teaching mentor. Their presence in the room to coach, facilitate, monitor, and adjust would be a critical element in the student teaching experience. Student teacher candidates would also be evaluated based on the formative and summative assessment evidence of their students. With regard to school partnerships, ideally, Gonzaga would ask that individual schools give a commitment for a minimum of two years.

We designed our committee work to provide equitable participation and active involvement among the PEAB members. This work involved several committee groups. They were as follows:

Group #1 A sub-committee reviewed the standards outlined in Standard V and developed examples of candidate and student evidence aligned to the respective standards.

Group #2 A sub-committee worked to develop criteria and components of high-quality partnerships between P-12 schools and Gonzaga.

Group #3 A sub-committee worked to develop a new field-experience paradigm that provided a tighter linkage between courses and field-work.

Group #4 A sub-committee provided input and advisement regarding the Department of Teacher Education's efforts to explore developing an Elementary Education major that is also aligned to Standard V.

After continuing to gather, interpret and analyze, additional relevant information; each subcommittee was asked to re- submit their professional recommendations with regard to their specific assigned area of study. During the May meeting, each subcommittee reported their recommendations to the PEAB. These recommendations were recorded and submitted.

The PEAB recommendations were given to the Department of Teacher Education to inform their work in developing the attached program design.

The PEAB reviewed the final proposal with particular attention to the efforts made to engage our candidates in the gathering and analysis of student evidence. Additionally, the three sample assessments were reviewed.

These are times that require us to have a great shift in our traditional paradigms. We look forward to next year to implement this program. Thank you for your consideration of our relevant, thoughtful work.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carrie Cox
PEAB

Appendix #1 - *Collection and Analysis of Student Evidence*

Secondary and Elementary Discipline Specific Methods Teacher Candidate assignment for collection and analysis of student evidence:

Instructions to teacher candidates

1) Choose a skill you will teach to your field experience class.

2) Write an objective that clearly states what the students will learn.

3) Write an assessment (student directions and rubric) that will show whether or not students have learned the skill.

4) Analyze each student's assessment to determine to what extent he or she met the objective.

5) Provide feedback to students in written form.

6) Bring copies of 3 assessments, one good, one midrange, and one poor together with the feedback you gave these students to your methods class.

7) In class we will analyze and discuss each other's assessments and feedback in learning community groups.

8) Be prepared to explain, how, with future assessments, you will know if your teaching, assessments, and feedback, had any impact on your students.

Next Steps

1) Once you are comfortable with analyzing written student evidence, add student voice by asking your students to assess their own learning by either using the same rubric or in narrative form.

2) Compare your analysis of student learning with your students' perception of their own learning.

(Sample)

Analysis of Student Evidence in Social Studies

Teacher candidates will show evidence that their students have learned how to analyze an historical cartoon.
The objective will be stated as follows.
Given a cartoon, the students will ANALYZE the cartoon by following the prescribed analysis process. Student's ability to analyze the cartoon will be assessed according to the accompanying rubric.

Cartoon Analysis Process

1) Place the cartoon in context – Place and Time
2) List the people and/or objects in the cartoon
3) Which of the objects are symbols?
4) What do you think each symbol means?
5) Which words in the cartoon (including the caption) appear to be the most important? Why do you think so??
6) Describe the action taking place in the cartoon
7) List adjectives that describe the emotions portrayed in the cartoon.
8) Explain the message of the cartoon.

Photograph/Painting/Sketch Analysis

1) Study the photograph/painting/sketch for about two minutes. Form an overall impression and then examine individual items.

2) Use the chart to list people, objects and activities in the photograph

PEOPLE	OBJECTS	ACTIVITIES

3) Based on what you have observed above, list three things you might infer from this photograph.
   i)
   ii)
   iii)

4) What questions does this photograph raise in your mind?

5) Where could you find answers to them?

STUDENT EVIDENCE IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Rubric accompanying Cartoon Analysis

Student Name _____

CATEGORY	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Context	The cartoon is placed in context - both time and place.	The cartoon is placed in either the correct time or place.	The cartoon is placed in either the wrong time or place.	The cartoon is placed in the wrong time and place.
People, Objects, Symbols	A list of all the people, objects and symbols in the cartoon is made. An explanation for each is provided.	A list of most of the people, objects and symbols in the cartoon is made. An explanation for each is provided.	A list of most of the people, objects and symbols in the cartoon is made. An explanation for some is provided.	A list of incorrect people, objects and symbols in the cartoon is made. Explanations are not provided..
Analysis of words and actions	Explanation and analysis of words and actions is clear and precise.	Explanation and analysis of words and actions is good.	Explanation and analysis of words and actions is not clear.	Explanation and analysis of words and actions is poor.
Analysis of the message	The over all analysis of the cartoon is clear and well expressed.	The over all analysis of the cartoon is good.	The over all analysis of the cartoon is poor.	The over all analysis of the carton is poor and does not explain the message of the cartoon.

Total Points: _____

Feedback:

Appendix #2 – Collection and Analysis of Student Evidence – Reading Diagnosis

COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF STUDENT EVIDENCE: READING DIAGNOSIS
Guidelines

Discuss this project with your co-operating teacher!

Identify a "struggling" reader within your field experience classroom. This could be a student who struggles with the reading process in some way, i.e. demonstrates an inconsistency in reading ability, reads well but doesn't comprehend, doesn't enjoy reading, etc.

Once that student has been identified, you will keep a journal and include the following information:

- observational notes on the student's behaviors in class, both academically and socially
- assumptions on the student's multiple intelligences from least to most dominant
- background information on the student's home life
- information on the student as a person
- miscue analysis
- retro-miscue analysis

Conduct a miscue analysis with the student and record your data.

Write a paper describing your student as a reader. Include what you have learned from your journal and your miscue analysis. Also, describe what your student needs in order to be a successful reader.

EDTE 331/540 Methods of Reading and Language Arts
COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS OF STUDENT EVIDENCE: READING DIAGNOSIS

Student: _____ **Date:**_____

	Below Standard		**Meets or Exceeds Standard**	
	No Evidence: No Attention to Standard 0	**Little Evidence: Below Standard 4**	**Clear Evidence: At Standard 8**	**Clear & Convincing Evidence Above Standard 10**
I. Personal profile of student	Written information not accurate or is not included.	Written information included but does not fully address the personal, social, emotional, and multiple intelligences.	Written information presents a cohesive report and is representative of the personal, social, emotional, and multiple intelligences.	Written information presents a cohesive report and is very representative of the personal, social, emotional, and multiple intelligences with examples (and/or applications).
II. Conduct a Miscue Analysis .	Information is not complete.	Miscue Analysis Form is not complete and/or information is missing or not correct.	Miscue Analysis Form is complete and information is correct.	Miscue Analysis Form is complete and information is correct and additional information is provided.
III. Intervention Strategies	Written information is not complete.	Written information includes some intervention strategies,	Written information includes intervention strategies and	Written information includes intervention strategies in great

IV. Reflection	Written information is not complete.	but does not fully address student needs. Written information includes personal insights about students and self as a teacher.	adequately addresses student needs. Written information includes personal insights about students and self as a teacher in depth and with detail.	detail with future implications and possibilities suggested to fully address student needs. Written information includes personal insights about students and self as a teacher in depth and with detail. Personal examples are provided.

Appendix #3 – Positive Impact Project

Positive Impact on Student Learning Project (PIP)
Analysis of Student Work

The analysis of student work portion of the PIP focuses on teacher candidates' ability to observe, gather, assess and interpret student evidence that informs future instructional decisions. These decisions, based on student data, will hopefully set into motion a series of data-driven actions that meets the needs of individual students, several students or a whole class in light of the work they produce.

The analysis of student work portion of the PIP specifically asks teacher candidates to systematically analyze selected student work samples. Thinking analytical about student work, particularly student responses to assignments, class work, assessments, and other instructional materials is a complex process. This process will be organized into three distinct steps: (1) observation and description, (2) analysis and interpretation, and (3) reflection.

Analysis of student work tasks: Choose an assignment from one of your classes that you thought elicited considerable information about your students' understandings. Gather together three different students' responses to the assignment. Be sure to choose three students who pose differing instructional challenges to you as a teacher.

Step #1: Observation and Description: Look carefully at the assignment or prompt to which the student work you have chosen responds. Answer the following introductory questions about the assignment.

1. What was the goal of this assignment?
2. How was this assignment connected to other activities in or out of class?
3. What subject-specific concepts did students need to know is order to complete this assignment successfully?
4. In what ways did you intend for this assignment to extend students' thinking about the topic?

Step #2: Analysis and Interpretation: Using the same three student responses, joy down answers to the following questions for each student. Here the emphasis is on your interpretation of what you see.

1. What is each student's most essential misunderstanding or difficulty?
2. How does each student's response fit into what you already know about this student's understanding and performance?
3. In two sentences for each student, describe what each learned from this assignment, judging from the responses.
4. What does each student need to do next to move his or her understanding forward?
5. For each of the three students, write a brief but very specific diagnosis of the degree to which this student work shows that your goals for the assignment were met.
6. Given each student's performance on this assignment, what goals should you set for each of these students in the immediate future?

Step #3: Reflection: The final stage in analyzing student responses is reflection on your practice. It is in this final step that you ask—in light of what the student response have told you about the students' understandings, difficulties, misconceptions, and gaps—what you might do next, or differently, or additionally for these students.

1. What did each student learn from this assignment and the instruction that preceded it? Be specific.
2. What did you learn from each student's response?
3. What would you do differently in light of the student responses to this assignment?
4. In light of your analysis, reevaluate your feedback strategies. Would you alter them in any way? If so, how and why? If not, why not?
5. Would you give the same assignment again? If so, would you prepare students for it differently? If so, how? If not, what assignment would you give in its place? Why?

Appendix #4 -Classroom Management Project: Collecting and Evaluating Student-based Evidence

This project is identified as a key assessment for NCATE the pass score on this assignment is 75 while 74 or below does not pass. Students who exceed on this assignment earn a score of 94 or higher. Please note that the final assignment is worth 100pts.

Each student is required to conduct and write up one assessment/treatment/evaluation plan using the methodologies presented in class. Students must select a child with whom they can directly interact. Students must conduct an assessment of the variables controlling the child's behavior and develop an intervention plan based on the initial assessment. The effects of the intervention selected should be demonstrated using a single-subject design. Each student will be required to meet with the professor during the semester to discuss progress on his/her project. The written summary should include the following sections: Introduction, Methodology, Results, and Discussion. Rough drafts of three of these sections are due throughout the semester.

The paper should be typed, double-spaced, and in APA format. All data should be presented on graphs and should be attached to the paper. As part of this class, students will learn to use Excel to chart their data. **Undergraduate** candidates may work in small groups on this project, but must meet with the professor prior to starting their project to get permission and to establish the responsibilities of each student for the project. Generally, you are required to work with more than one child if you are working in a small group. Graduate candidates must work independently.

Specific directions for how to write the methods, introduction and results sections are provided to the candidates during course sessions. Drafts are turned in at different points during the semester to ensure feedback and direction.

Directions for Completing the Introduction Rough Draft

The introduction should prepare the reader for the rest of your paper. Typically the introduction starts with broad based information about your topic including the type of disability, its affects on behavior or academic performance etc. As you progress your introductions should lead the reader to your research questions.

You should have 1 or 2 references that discuss the disability. The other references should be about the targeted behavior/DV, or the intervention/IV. Any articles you can find that discuss your DV and IV should definitely be included.

Include

A minimum of 6 references will be a part of your paper. Graduate candidates must have at least 10 references. Only one internet source may be used. Turn in a reference list in APA format with your introduction.

Here are some other tips: • Please type. • Double space. • Start intro. on it's own page. • Place the title of the paper at the top of your introduction. • Keep track of your references as you will create a reference list at the end of your paper. • If in doubt, include information. It is easier for me to scratch out irrelevant information than to help you add in missing information (especially because I may not know all the details!). • Feel free to insert brief notes to me if you really need help with something or if you have a question. I'll do my best to jot you a note to answer your question(s).

SAMPLE

The Effects of Sleep Deprivation on Preparation of Course Notes

At the top of the page, centered, type the title of your paper in title case. The first paragraph and the remaining paragraphs should consist of your introduction. It should look something like this. I hope this is enough of an example for you to get the idea of how the introduction should look. If you need more direction, you may want to look for the "putting it all together" handout in this section.

See the sample reference page below.

References

Bijou S. W., Peterson, R. F., & Ault, M. H. (1968). A method to integrate descriptive and experimental field studies at the level of data and empirical concepts. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 175-191.

Carr, E. G. (1994). Emerging themes in the functional analysis of problem behavior. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*, 393-399.

Directions for Completing the Method Rough Draft

Please use APA style to write your paper. Headings should be APA style and so should your citations and reference list. In this handout, I have outlined the information that should be included in your rough draft. The headings used are in APA style (in terms of whether they are centered, flush left, underlined, etc), and you should model your headings after them. In some cases, you may need to modify the text in the headings to best suit your project--every project is different, and, therefore, every paper will be different. In many cases, however, the headings needed in the Method section are quite similar. Some of you are further along on your projects than others, and so you will be able to write more. For those of you who are not so far along, please do as much as you can. The more information you provide me with and the more closely your rough draft approximates the final product, the better feedback I can give you!

Here are some other tips:

•Even though I did not double space your example to save space, You are expected to **double space your entire document according to APA standards**.
•Please type both your rough and final drafts, and use double spacing.
•Use the past tense only.
•The word "data" is PLURAL...therefore, use plural verbs with it.
•Write in the third person (e.g., refer to yourself as the first author or the experimenter.
•If in doubt, include information. It is easier for me to scratch out irrelevant information than to help you add in missing information (especially because I may not know all the details!).
•Feel free to insert brief notes to me if you really need help with something or if you have a question. I'll do my best to jot you a note to answer your question.

Method

Participant and Setting

In this section, describe your participant(s), providing all information relevant to the study. I find it helpful to give the participant a pseudonym to a) protect the child's confidentiality, and b) allow me not to have to call the child "the participant" every time I refer to him/her. Useful information includes the participant's age, diagnosis/disability (e.g., LD, autism, developmental delay), IQ, and area of difficulty (e.g., reading, math, social behavior). If your study was on increasing academic skills, it is also helpful to provide standardized scores for the academic area being studied. Provide a rational for why you selected this child for participation in the study (i.e., make the reader understand the social validity for doing what you did).

Next, describe the setting in which the study took place. For example, if you did the study in a classroom, describe the type of classroom, how many children were in the room during your sessions, which teachers were there, who conducted the sessions, etc.

Materials

Some of you may find it useful to include this section, and some of you may not have the need for it. Use your judgment, and include this section especially if you used any special materials to complete the project. For example, if you used a communication board, describe the symbols you used, how big the symbols were, whether they were laminated, etc. If you used specific reading materials, such as books or worksheets, describe them carefully, especially noting the reading level of the materials. If you used tokens or self-monitoring sheets, describe them. If you used rewards, describe them and how you selected them.

Dependent Variable

In this section, describe the behavior(s) you measured for your study. Make sure your behaviors are described in operational terms; that is, you should define them clearly and completely, and you should use terminology that is OBSERVABLE and QUANTIFIABLE. For example, if you measured the number of words read correctly, define what "correct" means. If you measured inappropriate behavior, define this term and give examples. You may have more than one dependent variable. Make sure you describe each one.

Data Collection and Inter observer Agreement

Describe the measurement system you used in your study, and clearly described how you used it. For example, if you used duration recording, describe when you started the stopwatch and when you stopped it. Did you reset it between each start and stop, or did you let it add on each time? If you used event recording, how did you tally each occurrence of the behavior? I often find it helpful if you attach a copy of your data-collection form to your paper as Appendix A. Also state who collected the data.

In the next paragraph, describe how interobserver agreement data were collected and how often the data were collected (e.g., on 5 of the 15 sessions, which constituted 33% of all sessions). State who collected the agreement data and that the two observers scored data simultaneously but independently (if this is the case, of course). State that you next compared the marks made by each observer, and what constituted an agreement and a disagreement. Then state the method you used for computing agreement scores (event ration, duration ratio, point-by-point agreement ration). Give the mean agreement score obtained as well as the range of scores.

I realize you will not have a lot of this information right now. Write your paper as if you had the information, but leave blanks where you will fill in the scores. For example, say, "Mean agreement was _____% (range ____% - ___%)."

Design

State the design (e.g., reversal, alternating treatments, multiple baseline) you used for the study. Then state how the design was implemented. For example, if you used a reversal design, state that you began with baseline, which lasted (how many?) days. Then intervention was implemented for (how many?) days. Next, a return to baseline was implemented for (how many?) days. Finally, intervention was implemented again for (how many?) days. If you implemented an alternating treatments design, state the conditions (or "treatments") that were alternated, and that they were alternated in a

counterbalanced fashion. If you used multiple baseline, state that you implemented intervention in a staggered fashion across (students, settings, or behaviors). State how many days of baseline were conducted for each "leg" of the design.

Procedures

This is the real "meat and potatoes" of the Method section. This section should very clearly describe what you did, such that someone who is completely unfamiliar with your study could read it and know exactly what to do. I find it helpful to divide this section by phase (in the case of reversal and multiple baseline) or by condition (in the case of alternating treatments. In the space below, I will provide an example of the former.

Baseline. Describe what occurred during baseline. In most cases, typical classroom procedures are in place. Make sure you describe these clearly. Describe how errors were corrected (or whether they weren't); describe how inappropriate behavior was consequated (if it was), and how appropriate responses were handled. Also describe any prompting procedures or stimulus cues that were present, if appropriate.

Intervention. (Please don't use the term "Intervention" here. I've done so for the sake of argument. Instead, use a more descriptive term that clearly identifies the intervention...for example say "Rewards," "Time Out," or "Interesting Reading Tasks," or the like...whatever suits your study.) Carefully describe your intervention (or the independent variable). Think about providing a task analysis of sorts of your intervention. In other words, give the reader a very prescriptive, step-by-step description of your intervention. Your description should be so clear that anyone could read it and then implement the treatment.

****

Once again, this may be an area that you are not completely finished with yet. Do the best you can with the information you currently have. Also, feel free to write what you plan to do if you haven't done it yet. This will help you clarify what you will be doing and may help you conduct your sessions more smoothly!

One final note...keeping mind that this is a rough draft. I do not expect this draft to be perfect. I will provide you with editorial assistance as needed (and then some, probably). My intention with this assignment is to a) not allow you to procrastinate writing this paper (!), and b) to help you be as successful as possible with this paper as possible. Keep in mind, the more effort you put into the rough draft, the better and more thorough feedback I can give, the more likely you will be to meet my expectations for your final paper! Thank you in advance for your efforts!

Note: Please make sure you are keeping your data sheets organized and neat. I will ask you to hand in your raw data with your paper at the end of the semester. This will serve, in part, to document the authenticity of your data.

Directions for Completing the Results Rough Draft

Your rough draft for the Results section should include a written summary of your data so far and a graph of your data so far. The graph does not have to be on Cricket Graph. Feel free to sketch your rough graph using paper and pencil. Once again, the more information you provide me, the better feedback I can give you. Once again, please use double spacing on both your rough and final drafts.

Results

Begin this section by stating that your results are displayed in Figure 1. Then simply begin describing your graph. Take it slow and easy. Don't rush through this section. If you used a reversal design, describe what happened during baseline. What was the mean performance and what was the range of scores? Then proceed to intervention. Given the same type of information. During the return to baseline, summarize the data, and so the same for the final intervention phase. If you used an alternating treatments design, describe what happened during each condition (treatment) one by one. If

you used a multiple baseline design, describe what happened during baseline and intervention for each individual participant. If you had multiple participants, and you used an alternating treatments or reversal design, you may find it helpful to divide this section into individual paragraphs with a subheading with each participant's name preceding the paragraph. If you had multiple phases in your study, you may want to have a subheading prior to each paragraph. After the paragraph describing a graph, insert a reference to the graph. I have included a sample of a multiple phase study in the space below.

Preference Assessment

Results of the preference assessment are displayed in Figure 1. Matt selected ice cream on 80% of the times he was offered the choice, the most often of all of the items. Stickers were never selected when they were offered, which resulted in stickers being selected the least often. All other items ranked between these two stimuli with pencils being selected 65% of the time, ...etc.

Baseline

The baseline section should include the overall results for this condition. If your baseline indicated zero correct responses and was stable say that.

Intervention

The results of Matt's intervention are displayed in Figure 2. During Baseline, Matt displayed on-task behavior during an average of only 20% (range 0 - 30%). However, with the implementation of intervention, Matt's on-task behavior improved to an average of 98% (range 50 - 100%). When intervention was removed and a return to baseline was implemented, his on-task behavior decreased to a mean of 10% (range 0 - 15%). When intervention was reinstated again, on-task behavior increased to a mean of 95% (range 80 - 100%).

Note: Your Results section should not contain any conclusions about why you think you got the results you did or what you think about your data. Offer NO explanations here. Save this information for your Discussion section. The results section should simply state the facts of what happened.

In regard to your graph(s):

- Do not incorporate them into the text. The graphs should be placed at the end of your paper. See APA format.
- Do not put a title on your graph. APA style dictates that no titles should be present. Instead, you should have a page entitled Figure Captions (centered on the top line of the page). Then, on the next line, flush left, indented, and underlined, type Figure 1. Then include a brief description of your graph. For example:

  Figure 1. Percentage of on-task behavior during both baseline and intervention for Matt.

- The Figure Captions page should come right after your references and just before your graph.
- Be sure to label all portions of the graph. Label the x-axis as "Sessions" (in most cases), and label the y-axis with the dependent variable (e.g., number of words read correctly, number of errors, percentage of intervals with inappropriate behavior).
- Do not connect data points across phase changes (i.e., from baseline to intervention), and make sure you draw a dashed phase line between phases.
- Make your graphs large enough and easy enough to read.

Remember: Please make sure you are keeping your data sheets organized and neat. I will ask you to hand in your raw data with your paper at the end of the semester. This will serve, in part, to document the authenticity of your data.

EDSE465 Classroom Management Project Grading Rubric- Undergraduate

Candidate(s) name(s):_____
Title of Project:_____

Research Verification Form - Turned In	**Yes** ❑	**1 pt**	**No** ❑	**0 pts**	
Raw Data - Turned In	**Yes** ❑	**1 pt**	**No** ❑	**0 pts**	
Emailed entire paper & graphs	**Yes** ❑	**2 pts**	**Partial** ❑	**1 pt**	**No** ❑ **0 pts**
Data collection sheet attached	**Yes** ❑	**1 pt**	**No** ❑	**0 pts**	
Sample of materials used attached	**Yes** ❑	**1 pt**	**No** ❑	**0 pts**	

Points Awarded	***0***	***1***	***2***	***3***	***4***
Overall Quality/Style of Paper					
Typed/Double Spaced	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Spelling/Grammar/Punctuation	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Use of Third Person/Past Tense	❑	❑	❑	❑	
APA Style Headings	❑	❑	❑	❑	
APA Style Citations❑	❑	❑	❑		
APA Style Reference List	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Introduction					
Summarizes disability/topic	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Includes 6 (minimum) citations	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Includes purpose statement	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Method					
Participant(s) described	❑	❑	❑		
Setting(s)/Materials(s) described	❑	❑	❑		
Dependent variable defined	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Measurement system described	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Inter-observer agreement described	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Design described	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Procedures for each phase described	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Results					
Results described clearly	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Results described accurately	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Amount of data collected adequate	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Changes in phase condition appropriate	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Graphs accurately drawn/labeled	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Neatness of graphs ❑	❑	❑	❑		
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Discussion					
Why results occurred discussed	❑	❑	❑		
Importance of results discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Strengths of study discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Weaknesses of study discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Future directions of this or other projects discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Bonus

Graphs Done on Cricket or EXCEL Graph **Yes ❑ 1pt** **No ❑ 0 pts**

Total points= _____/100

EDSE575 Classroom Management Project Grading Rubric- Graduate

Candidate(s) name(s):_____
Title of Project:_____

Research Verification Form - Turned In	**Yes**	❑ **1 pt**	**No**	❑ **0 pts**		
Raw Data - Turned In	**Yes**	❑ **1 pt**	**No**	❑ **0 pts**		
Emailed entire paper & graphs	**Yes**	❑ **2 pts**	**Partial** ❑ **1 pt**		**No** ❑ **0 pts**	
(Note graphs must be done using EXCEL)						
Data collection sheet attached	**Yes**	❑ **1 pt**	**No**	❑ **0 pts**		
Sample of materials used attached	**Yes**	❑ **1 pt**	**No**	❑ **0 pts**		

Points Awarded	***0***	***1***	***2***	***3***	***4***	***5***
Overall Quality/Style of Paper						
Typed/Double Spaced	❑	❑				
Spelling/Grammar/Punctuation	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Use of Third Person/Past Tense	❑	❑				
APA Style Headings	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
APA Style Citations❑	❑	❑	❑			
APA Style Reference List	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Introduction						
Summarizes disability/topic/research base	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Includes 10 citations (minimum)	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Includes purpose statement	❑	❑	❑			
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Method						
Participant(s) described	❑	❑	❑			
Setting(s)/Materials(s) described	❑	❑				
Dependent variable defined	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Measurement system described	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Inter-observer agreement described	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Design described	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Procedures for each phase described	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Results						
Results described clearly	❑	❑	❑			
Results described accurately	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Amount of data collected adequate	❑	❑	❑			
Changes in phase condition appropriate	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Graphs accurately drawn/labeled	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	
Neatness of graphs ❑	❑	❑	❑			
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Discussion						
Why results occurred discussed	❑	❑	❑			
Importance of results discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Strengths of study discussed	❑	❑	❑			
Weaknesses of study discussed	❑	❑	❑			
Future directions of this or other projects discussed	❑	❑	❑	❑		
Overall quality	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	

Total points= _____/100

Appendix #5 – Assessment Project

Assessment Project

A. The goal of this project is to complete a comprehensive multi-factored assessment of a child. The components included in your assessment should be child specific, and there should be a sound rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of each component. Six components are required:

a. Observation (6 times with two reliability checks; one pre- and one post intervention). Observations need to be recorded in an observation data sheet designed for the student being evaluated.
b. Interview (parent required)
c. Completion of the Woodcock Johnson Test of Achievement
e. Curriculum Based Assessments using the materials provided and one conducted using classroom materials for the subject area believed to be problematic
f. Evaluation using an instructional strategy using a single subject design. This design needs to include a **reversal!**
g. A file containing all the assessments, a case log, data summary sheets (primary and reli), and the assessment summary.

The purpose of this assessment is seven-fold. First you should become comfortable in the administration and interpretation of special education related tools. Second, you should become skilled in using assessment data to improve the quality of education for a child. Third, you should be able to report the findings of a multi-factored assessment in a user friendly fashion (written and oral). Fourth, you should be able to use the information provided by formal assessment tools to identify subjects that require additional assessment via Curriculum Based Assessments. Fifth, you should be able to use assessment results to identify teaching strategies. Sixth, you should be able to verify the utility of the teaching strategy using diagnostic teaching (i.e., a single subject design). Seventh, you should be able keep an organized case log.

B. Written product: The final report is due as indicated in your syllabus. It should be typewritten, double spaced, and well edited. Professional objectivity and comprehensiveness as well as insight will be rewarded. The first part of the formal report will be 3-5 pages. The educational recommendations will range between 1-2 pages.

C. Oral Presentation: You will be asked to provide the class with an oral presentation of our findings. A key to getting a good grade on this assignment is to present our findings in a way that every member of an IEP would understand (i.e, parents, other teachers, and possibly the student being evaluated.

D. When to start: The best time to begin as soon as you meet with your master teacher. See if the master teacher has a student in mind and if he/she has a WCJ you can use.

E. Assessment Devices: Unfortunately we have a limited test library. Each test will need to be checked out in Rm. 100.

G. Commitment: Students reported that they spent from 10-15 hours with the child for their projects. This information should be communicated with the master teacher from the outset, and the evaluations should be spread out.

Guidelines for Conducting a Multi-factored Assessment

1. Follow the recommendations found in the text regarding the ethics of assessment and pay particular attention to those items related to "labeling" children.
2. Indicate to the teacher (or parent) that the purpose of your assessment is to: (1) provide you with the opportunity to practice appropriate assessment protocols; (2) set the occasion for you to integrate new assessment data into the student's program; and (3) determine the interrelationship between assessment, instruction, and evaluation.
3. Limit your assessment to one or two areas (e.g., reading, sight vocabulary, spelling). Base the area(s) you are assessing on the data you obtain.
4. Plan to conduct a series of assessments with the student. Each session may take about 1 hour. Adjust accordingly for older and/or younger students.
5. Make sure at the beginning of the assessment that you take the time to establish rapport with the student and place the student at ease. During the assessment, provide reinforcement for effort, but do not provide specific feedback on responses.
6. Take notes during and after the assessment on collateral behaviors (e.g., amount of effort, perseverance, writing posture, attending, verbal and nonverbal behaviors). Inform the student ahead of time that you will be taking notes throughout the assessment. I would not recommend video or audio taping the assessment session at this time.
7. If the student seems fatigued, rest for a period of time.
8. Select a range of assessment instruments and tools and be prepared to modify the assessment contingency on the student's responses. Be thoroughly familiar with the test protocol before you use it with a student. Practice with a friend several times in advance of your session with the student.
9. Type your report and submit it by the due date. **(Remember to get feedback)**

Multi-factored Assessment Format

- Obtain Referral and Consent- (first three weeks of class)
- Conduct Initial Teacher/Parent Interview- (first five weeks of class)
- Conduct General Academic Achievement Test- (first five weeks of class)
- Conduct Informal Assessments (CBA)- (Completed within 3 weeks of student teaching)
- Conduct Specific Achievement Testing in Subject Area Identified as Problematic (if needed)
- Develop a CBA for the Subject Area Identified as Problematic- (Completed within 4 weeks of student teaching)
- Observe Child Performance when working in Problematic Subject Area- (Completed within 4 weeks of student teaching)
- Develop Intervention Strategies- (Completed within 5 weeks of student teaching)
- Observe Student with Intervention in Place- (Completed within 5 weeks of student teaching)
- This gives you 2 to 3 week to write your report!

Parent/Guardian Consent Form for Participation in Practice Assessment

I agree to allow my child to participate in a multi-factorial assessment conducted by pre-service special education teachers from Gonzaga University. This assessment is part of a course dealing with individualized educational assessments. The students conducting the assessments are under the supervision of Dr. Mark Derby and Ethel Kellogg of the Department of Special Education at Gonzaga University. Classroom observations, review of school records, discussions with teachers and service providers, standardized achievement testing, social/emotional and adaptive behavior indicators, and other types of relevant educational data will be included in this multi-factorial educational assessment.

I understand the results of this assessment will not be used to classify or place my child. My child's identity will be kept confidential during the course of the assessment process and in any subsequent papers, documents, presentations, and other forms of dissemination of results dealing with this procedure. Results of this multi-factorial assessment will be provided and explained to the parent at the conclusion of this testing process. Additionally, I understand that I may withdraw consent for my child's participation at any time. If there are any questions, comments, or concerns I will contact Dr. Mark Derby at 328-4220, extension 3633.

I fully understand that this program is being conducted by Gonzaga University and not by Spokane School District. By signing below, I represent my understanding that Gonzaga University is solely responsible for the implementation and any continuation of this program.

_____

Name of Student

_____ _____

Signature of Parent or Guardian **Date**

_____ _____

Dr. Mark Derby **Date**

Being Guest In the Schools

Above all, all students need to remember that we are guests. Thus, there are some guidelines each team needs to follow.

a) **Never be alone with the student you are evaluating.**
b) Teachers are very busy people, so you need to call them when they are not in class with students. If you need to cancel an appointment, simply leave a message with the school secretary.
c) Always be courteous to the secretaries!
d) Try to make appointments at times that are convenient to the teachers.

Assessment Summary Scoring Criteria

Use of vocabulary that would be understandable to all members of an IEP team.	10 points
Description of student history	10 points
Description of formal tests (indicating why each assessment was chosen, results,)	10 points
Description of Informal tests	10 points
Description of Intervention	20 points
Effective use of figures to show the effectiveness of the intervention	10 points
Organized case folder with case log, assessment forms, data sheets etc.	10 points
Effective writing (i.e., punctuation)	10 points
Understandable Recommendations	10 points
	Total 100 points

School/home visit log

Name_____ Parent Name_____ Phone_____

Address_____

date	place	duration	GU student

Appendix #6 – Observation of Candidate and Student Learning

Observation of Candidate & Student Learning

Student Teacher: _____ Cooperating Teacher: _____
Supervisor: _____ Time: _____ Date: _____

* NO = Not Observed; 10-8 = Excellent to Good; 7 = Satisfactory; 6 = Needs Improvement; 5-1 = Unacceptable

	Foundations: Candidate	*	Notes
1.	Maintained poise in stressful situations.		
2.	Varied pitch, tone, and volume of voice as needed.		
3.	Moved purposefully and maintained eye contact when talking to students.		
4.	Showed evidences of appropriate, positive attitudes and enthusiasm for teaching.		
5.	Assembled materials and equipment prior to time of use.		
6.	Started class promptly and used available time for instructional purposes.		
7.	Collected and distributed materials with minimal loss of time.		
Development & Characteristics of Learners: Candidate			
8.	Supervised work-study and practice in an effective manner for all children.		
9.	Changed instructional pace or activity to accommodate individual differences and effectively teach all children.		
Individual Learner Differences: Candidate			
10.	Selected activities and materials that achieved objectives as evidenced by positive child outcomes.		
11.	Gave explanations and directions that were understood by students as evidenced by child outcomes.		
Instructional Strategies: Candidate			
12.	Presented subject matter with accuracy and assurance.		
13.	Used a variety of personalized approval responses.		
14.	Dealt with inappropriate behavior promptly and constructively.		
15.	Summarized highlights of the lesson.		
16.	Used materials and equipment effectively.		
17.	Used modern technology effectively		
18.	Encouraged students to evaluate their work on the basis of established criteria.		
Learning Environments & Social Interactions: Candidate			
19.	Let students know what they would be doing during the lesson.		
20.	Encouraged participation of all students in the learning activity.		
21.	Provided opportunity for all students to participate in the learning activity.		
Language: Candidate			
22.	Set a good example in use of communication skills.		
Instructional Planning: Candidate			
23.	Made assignments of reasonable length and difficulty.		
24.	Reviewed related ideas or information that had been presented in previous lessons.		
Professional/Ethical Practice: Candidate			
25.	Modeled positive attitudes and insisted on courtesy in interpersonal relationships.		
Assessment: Candidate			
26.	Encourage students to demonstrate understanding of learning strategies (student voice)		
	Specify how this was accomplished:		
	Describe how student identified learning targets:		